

**GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH**

**ABSTRACT**

Public Services – Sri Ch. Janardhana Rao, the then Assistant Engineer, PR, Narasannapeta, Srikakulam District - Departmental Proceedings under Rule 20 of Andhra Pradesh Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal), Rules, 1991 – Articles Of Charge – Issued.

---

**PANCHAYAT RAJ AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (VIG. II) DEPARTMENT**

**G.O. Rt. No. 832**

**Dt:18 -05-2013**

**Read:-**

- (1) Govt. Memo. No. 19064/Vig.II/A1/2012-1 PR & RD Dept., Dt. 20.04.2011
- (2) From the ENC, PR, Lr. No. Vig. I (1)/3509/2011, Dt. 21.02.2013

**ORDER:**

It is proposed to hold an inquiry against Sri Ch. Janardhana Rao, the then Assistant Engineer, PR, Narasannapeta, Srikakulam District in accordance with the procedure laid down in Rule 20 of the Andhra Pradesh Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1991.

2. The substance of the imputations of misconduct or misbehaviour in respect of which the inquiry is proposed to be held is set out in the enclosed statement of Articles of charges (Annexure-I). A list of documents by which, and a list of witnesses by whom, the articles of charges are proposed to be sustained, are also enclosed (Annexure-II and Annexure-III).

3. Sri Ch. Janardhana Rao, the then Assistant Engineer, PR, Narasannapeta, Srikakulam District is directed to submit within 10 days from the receipt of this order, a written statement of his defence.

4. Sri Ch. Janardhana Rao, the then Assistant Engineer, PR, Narasannapeta, Srikakulam District is informed that an inquiry will be held only in respect of those articles of charges that are not admitted. He should, therefore, specifically admit or deny each article of charge.

5. Sri Ch. Janardhana Rao, the then Assistant Engineer, PR, Narasannapeta, Srikakulam District is further informed that if he does not submit his written statement of defence on or before the date specified in para 3 above or otherwise fails or refuses to comply with the provisions of rule 20 of Andhra Pradesh Civil Services (CCA) Rules, 1991 or the orders/directions issued in pursuance of the said rules, the Inquiry Authority may hold the inquiry against him ex parte.

6. Attention of Sri Ch. Janardhana Rao, the then Assistant Engineer, PR, Narasannapeta, Srikakulam District is invited to Rule 24 of the Andhra Pradesh Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964, under which no Government Servant shall bring or attempt to bring any political or outside influence to bear upon any superior authority to further his interest in respect of matters pertaining to his service under the Government. If any representation is received on his behalf from another person in respect of any matter dealt within these proceedings, it will be presumed that Sri Ch. Janardhana Rao, the then Assistant Engineer, PR, Narasannapeta, Srikakulam District is aware of such a representation and that it has been made at his instance and action will be taken against him for violation of Rule 24 of the Andhra Pradesh Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964.

7. The receipt of this order shall be acknowledged forthwith.

(BY ORDER AND IN THE NAME OF THE GOVERNOR OF ANDHRA PRADESH)

Encl: Annexure I to III

V. NAGI REDDY  
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVT (PR)

To

- (1) Sri Ch. Janardhana Rao, the then Assistant Engineer, PR, Narasannapeta, Srikakulam District **through** the Engineer-in-Chief (PR), Hyderabad.
- (2) The Engineer-in-Chief(PR), Hyderabad – with a request to serve the memo., to the individual and return the dated acknowledgment copy to Govt.
- (3) Copy to Estt-II Section for information
- (4) Copy to P.S. to Minister (PR &RWS)/ P.S. to Prl. Secy to Govt (PR)
- (5) SF/SC.

//FORWARDED BY ORDER//

**SECTION OFFICER**

**ANNEXURE – I**  
**STATEMENT OF ARTICLE OF CHARGE FRAMED AGAINST SRI CH. JANARDHANA RAO,**  
**THE THEN ASSISTANT ENGINEER, PR, NARASANNAPETA, SRIKAKULAM DISTRICT**

**Article:**

That the said Sri Ch. Janardhana Rao, the then Assistant Engineer, PR, Narasannapeta, Srikakulam District has committed certain irregularities in execution of work construction of bridge in Jalamuru (M), Srikakulam district, as he was responsible for (1) executing the work prior to approval of designs and drawings, (2) recording the measurements without dates and cancelling the same without sufficient reasons, (3) execution of work after the lapse of agreement period without the approval of EOAT, (4) execution of defective concrete work, (5) recording excess quantity of steel than the approved designs.

**Basis of the Charge:-**

The V&E officials have inspected the work on the allegation of irregularities in construction of bridge in Jalamuru (M), Srikakulam district and made the following findings.

**Findings of the V&E:**

1. The agreement for the work was concluded on 30.06.2008 and the hydraulic particulars were approved on 16.02.2009 (after 8.5 months). Designs were approved on 20.02.2009. The period of completion of the work is 9 months and the field officers who are located in the same district could not finalise the designs for 8.5 months which amply proves the negligent attitude in finalizing the proposals.
2. The fact that the designs are approved on 20.02.2009 and the work of leveling coarse under raft and reinforcement for raft were recorded on 30.12.2008 proves that the work was executed prior to date of approval of designs. The DEE in his version accepted the same. Hence, allegation of execution of work without obtaining approval for designs including vent way calculations and foundations is substantiated.
3. An excess quantity of 1.1 MT of steel was used when checked with the approved designs which is due to execution without approved drawings which is accepted by the DEE. Hence the allegation regarding excess usage of steel without approval is established.
4. The designs for the work were approved on 20.02.2009 and the work is reported to be completed on 28.03.2009 i.e., within the agreement period (as per basic data sheet given by field officers annexed as annexure-A13). This clearly shows that the work is executed beyond agreement period and recorded within the agreement period to avoid the EOAT. It is not known what prompted the field officers to act like this as the contractor is legitimately eligible for EOAT as designs are delayed.
5. The analysis of test results conducted on cores extracted from hardened concrete of deck slab and abutment reveals that the compressive strengths are much below the required standards and are liable for rejection. The rejected value of work is Rs. 3,72,170/- (Annexure-A12).
6. Even though Rs. 20.00 lakhs was spent on the bridge, there is no end to the suffering of people as there are no approaches to the bridge, with the result that the bridge was not put to use. This is solely because of improper planning and preparation of estimates by the field officers resulting in wasteful expenditure. Hence the allegation that the non-completion of work has resulted in wastage of funds is established.

Therefore, Sri Ch. Janardhana Rao, the then Assistant Engineer, PR, Narasannapeta, Srikakulam District has failed to discharge his legitimate duties properly and executed substandard work. Thus his action is in violation of APCS (Conduct) Rules, 1964.

Hence, this Charge.

V. NAGI REDDY  
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVT (PR)

**SECTION OFFICER**

**ANNEXURE – II**  
**LIST OF DOCUMENTS BY WHICH THE ARTICLES OF CHARGE FRAMED AGAINST CH.**  
**JANARDHANA RAO, THE THEN ASSISTANT ENGINEER, PR, NARASANNAPETA,**  
**SRIKAKULAM DISTRICT ARE PROPOSED TO BE SUSTAINED**

Vigilance Report No. 156 (619/V&E/E1/2010), Dated. 31.12.2010

V. NAGI REDDY  
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVT (PR)

**SECTION OFFICER**

**ANNEXURE-III**  
**LIST OF WITNESSES BY WHOM THE ARTICLES OF CHARGE FRAMED AGAINST CH.**  
**JANARDHANA RAO, THE THEN ASSISTANT ENGINEER, PR, NARASANNAPETA,**  
**SRIKAKULAM DISTRICT ARE PROPOSED TO BE SUSTAINED**

-- NIL—

V. NAGI REDDY  
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVT (PR)

**SECTION OFFICER**